

# COMMUNISM AGAINST DEMOCRACY



TREASON PRESS

GPO Box 2427 CANBERRA ACT 2601  
CANBERRATREASON@YAHOO.COM.AU  
[HTTP://TREASON.METADNS.CX](http://TREASON.METADNS.CX)





# TREASON PRESS PAMPHLETS

For a catalogue listing all our pamphlets please get in touch, addresses are on the back cover.

## **Against Domestication**

Jacques Cammatte's critique of capital's tendency towards the total subsumption of human life.

## **'Anti-Capitalism' as Ideology...and as Movement?**

From the 2001 issue of the excellent annual communist journal from Britain, *Aufheben*, a critique of the anti-summit movement.

## **Behind the Twenty-First Century Intifada**

Also from the 2001 issue of *Aufheben* a look at the proletarian elements of the Palestinian revolt in opposition to the usual presentation of it as a purely nationalist, state-building affair.

## **Global War for the World Order**

Four articles from the German group *Wildcat* analysing the "War on Terror".

## **Mutinies: A Historical Reader**

A collection of articles on mutinies against the Vietnam, Bosnia and Kosovo wars.

## **Outside and Against the Unions**

A communist critique of trade unions focusing on the 1984-5 miners strike in Britain from British group *Wildcat*.

## **Pirate Utopias: Under the Banner of King Death**

Aaargh maties, pirate struggles against early capitalism described in this article from issue 8 of *Do Or Die*.

## **Society of the Spectacle**

The classic 1967 critique of spectacular capitalism by Guy Debord of *The Situationist International*.

## **The Neoliberal Wars**

Articles on the wars in Yugoslavia, Somalia, Chechnya and Afghanistan as well as a theoretical discussion of how neo-liberalism leads to civil war.

## **The Myth of Passivity**

Class struggles against neoliberalism in New Zealand in the 1990s.

## **When Insurrections Die**

Gilles Dauve's article about the failure of the post-World War One revolutionary wave, from Russia in 1917 to Spain in 1936, focusing on how proletarian revolt was diverted into mere anti-fascism.

## **Whither the World**

Co-author of the classic *Eclipse and Re-emergence of the communist Movement* Gilles Dauve and Karl Nestic discuss the current malaise of both capital and proletariat in this piece from early 2002.

# CONTENTS

1. **Introduction** 4
2. **Against Democracy**  
***Wildcat*** 5
3. **...And Democracy Continues its March**  
***Against Sleep and Nightmare*** 9

# INTRODUCTION

The two texts in this pamphlet are communist critiques of democracy. Not just “bourgeois democracy” but democracy as such. Democracy implies the separation of people into isolated, warring individuals. This isolation will be overcome in struggles against capitalism (and thus democracy). These struggles will need to be organised but not by a mass of atomised individuals voting on decisions, then acting. Most struggles do not happen because a mass of citizens vote to take action but because a determined minority of troublemakers take bold action – such as going on wildcat strike, blocking a highway or bricking the pigs. Hopefully others then follow their good example.

Democracy is the ideal form of capitalist rule. Of course capitalism can and does quite happily exist under various forms of undemocratic rule, whether fascist, military dictatorship, monarchy or “Communism”. But “one man, one vote” corresponds to the abstract equality of capitalism where my dollar is worth just as much as Kerry Packer’s. It is no coincidence that in the last 30 years during which life has been subordinated to monetary relations like never before that more and more states have become democratic. There are no military dictatorships left in Latin America. Since 2000 the US has sponsored democratic rebellions in Serbia, Ukraine, Georgia and Kirgizstan. The neo-con ideologues really believe that they are bringing democracy to Afghanistan and Iraq. Sure the US military slaughters civilians en masse and at will in those places but this is merely what we are tending towards in the long established democracies. The death squads of the “War on Terror” are killing Brazilian electricians on the London Underground as well as Iraqi demonstrators.

Other texts by *Against Sleep and Nightmare* can be found at: <http://www.againstsleepandnightmare.com>.  
Other texts by *Wildcat* can be found at: [http://www.againstsleepandnightmare.com/wildcat/SUBSPAGE.html#\\_ftn1](http://www.againstsleepandnightmare.com/wildcat/SUBSPAGE.html#_ftn1)

Canberra, Australia  
August 2005

The dispossessed should not be fair but be alive and strong. To be anti-democratic is to reject the fetish of democracy, to not give any voting process an inherently superior position over the total process of living. Proletarians, those who have nothing to lose from the destruction of this society and know it, must become anti-democratic to achieve their ends.

Workers must seize control of their workplace or their neighborhood. Not to manage them in the same way as before but to have as much power as possible. Even if at a certain point a group of proletarians use votes to decide the path taken, they cannot allow democratic blessings to justify their actions any more than they can allow reformism, unionism, or pacifism to mystify their actions. The number in favour of a decision will be only one factor among many influencing those who refuse the democratic fetish.

## **Minorities Confronting Democracy**

The passive of today accept democracy more than ever. This weakness may be partially offset by the tremendous willingness of the system’s propagandists to rely on raw democracy to accomplish its goals. Freedom of choice is no longer only given as a concession but is pushed constantly as a weapon.

At the point when revolutionaries realize that they have nothing to lose from the destruction of this society, they may realize the mirage of its democracy. The LA riots were the most undemocratic action imaginable – absolutely no permission was ever asked by those who looted, either from authorities or from unions or from workers councils. Still there was no conscious critique of democracy in that short time in LA.

So we can imagine many more insurrections, like Paris 68, where masses with many democratic and other bourgeois illusions act in a practically communist manner. Here, if the word “democracy” is used by people to describe reconquering their own lives, self-conscious communists wouldn’t mindlessly attack it. Rather, an anti-democratic minority would spell-out the practical actions that are necessary to achieve a new society and show how little formal democracy has to do with them. In those conditions, an anti-democratic minority is in a good position to fight the mystifications that have served as breaks on the earlier movements.

No scheme for managing society will by itself create a new society. Highly democratic, highly authoritarian and mixed schemes are now used to administer capitalism. The basic quality of capitalism is that the average person has little or no control over their daily life. Wage labor dominates society. You must exchange your life to buy back your survival. Whether people under capitalism make the decisions about which records they buy, which inmates serve long sentences, what color the street lights are, etc., is irrelevant.

The community that escapes capitalism will involve people directly controlling the way they live. This is the individual and collective refusal of work, commodity production, and exploitation. This will involve much collective decision making and much individual decision making. The transformation cannot be reduced to a set way of making decisions or a fixed plan of action.

*Not believing in democracy means not automatically knowing how to proceed if people have profound disagreements. So be it.*

### **Anti-democratic Communism**

Communists do not say that without capitalism we can guarantee that humans will create a human community. It says that with capitalism, humans cannot create a human community. It sees that any movement for a true community will oppose capitalist social order and social relationships all along the way. The motivating force will not come with a communist blueprint. It will come from living proletarians creating new social relations.

The spirit of collective power, of a community of masters, is exactly the opposite of the democratic spirit. Democracy drowns the individual in the choices of the majority. It presumes that the individual choice is always hostile to the power of the masses. Thus democratic ideology creates the paranoia that everything contrary to its current formalism of process is the same as Stalinist dictatorship.

The spirit of proletarian struggle can be seen when a group of partisans fan-out to defend a city. Each wing has the power to act alone in attacking capitalist forces. Each wing is just as willing to give in to the authority of the other proletarians when they indicate they know the terrain better.

The formal decision making process will depend on the situation. Unanimity, a majority vote, or minority action will be used depending on the terrain of the battle. It is not a matter of fixed rights but of people supporting each other.

Those who are taking back their lives must be strong and alive, not fair and democratic. When a mass of comrades satisfy their desires by looting a supermarket, they have acted directly on their collective wills. But it is ridiculous to say this action was fairer than them collectively voting for a congresswoman/man or voting to raise their taxes to pay for more police. They violated “process” by not polling everyone beforehand. It’s not a matter of whether looters could ever have the right number of people together to “have permission” to act. Proletarians should always act as actively allied creators of a new order, not as passively equal citizens.

Virtually all of the past two hundred years’ lurches towards the potlatch, towards communism, have begun undemocratically. The rioters of LA did not require the formal permission of a decision-making body before creating their explosion. The insurrection that started the Spanish Civil War in 1936 began with a spontaneous reaction of workers to Francisco Franco’s military coup. The wildcat general strike in May of 1968 in Paris began with a spontaneous rejection of the entire society that was fuelled by street fighting.

These same insurrections have tended to end when the fetish of democracy reasserted itself. May 68 reached its limits with union officials still controlling the gates of the striking factories. These elected representatives of the workers separated the movement until everything cooled down. (Again there was certainly a lot of cheating in the French CGT’s “union democracy” but this wouldn’t have changed the final result.) In Spain, democratically elected anarchist union leaders controlled the tendency to communalise all of society. They were able to convince the most militant workers that it would be undemocratic to impose socialism without the approval of the passive majority.

## **AGAINST DEMOCRACY**

*This is the text of an introductory talk which was given to two discussion meetings held in London and Brighton in 1993. It’s been typed up and made available to the communist public due to massive popular demand...*

The purpose of this little talk is to convince you that revolutionaries should oppose democracy in it all its forms.

Before we go any further, I want to get the argument about the use of words out of the way. A lot of people will agree with a lot of what I’m saying (or will think that they do!) but will say “Ah, yes, but what you’re talking about is bourgeois democracy. What I mean by democracy is something quite different.” I want to suggest that when people talk about “real” or “workers” democracy in opposition to bourgeois democracy, in fact they *do* mean the same thing that the bourgeoisie mean by democracy, despite superficial differences. The fact that they chose to use the word democracy is actually far more significant than they claim. This is why it is important to say “Death to democracy!”. A less obscure analogy might be that of the word “development”. Third Worldist lefties will generally say that they are in favour of development. When you say “Isn’t that what the IMF want?”, they’ll say “No, we want *real* development”. When you talk to them a bit more you find out that in fact they do want the same as the IMF...it’s just that the IMF have got a more realistic understanding of what it means.

My basic contention here will be that however much you claim to be against property (as Lenin-Trotsky-Stalinists do) or even against the state (as anarchists do), if you support democracy you *are* actually for property and for the state.

### **What is Democracy?**

In the most general terms, democracy is the rule of rights and equality. It’s pretty easy to see that this is capitalist. “Rights” implies the existence of atomised individuals in competition with each other. It also implies the existence of the state, or some quasi-state form of authority, which can guarantee people’s rights. “Equality” implies the existence of a society in which people can have equal worth – that is, a society based on abstract labour. Democracy is often defined as the Rule of the People – the People always being understood as a mass of atomised citizens with rights.

On a very abstract level you can say that capitalism is always democratic. You can say that democracy expresses the essence of capital (if you like putting things in those sort of terms!) that equality is just an expression of the equivalence of commodities.

Marx made the ultimate abusive comment about democracy when he described it as “Christian”:

“Political democracy is Christian inasmuch as it regards man – not just one man but all men – as a *sovereign* and supreme being; but man in his uncultivated, unsocial aspect, man in his contingent existence, man just as he is, man as he has been corrupted, lost to himself, sold, and exposed to the rule of inhuman conditions and elements by the entire organisation of our society – in a word, man who is not yet a true species-being. The sovereignty of man – but of man as an alien being distinct from actual man – is the fantasy, the dream, the postulate of Christianity, whereas in democracy it is a present and material reality, a secular maxim.”

Marx, *On the Jewish Question*

## So what are the practical consequences of all this?

The most common ways that the democratic counter-revolution expresses itself in the class struggle is around the questions of *class power* and the *organisation* of that power.

By “class power” I mean the recognition of the fact that we are in a class war situation and that to advance our side in that war and ultimately win it we have to ruthlessly crush and exterminate our enemies. Obviously this implies despotic power in itself. You can’t respect the rights of a cop if you are beating him to death! If a trade union leader tries to address a meeting and we respond by shouting him down or dragging him off the stage and kicking his head in, it’s absurd for us to say that we believe in freedom of speech. “The revolution will not be televised” – nor will it be monitored by Amnesty International.

In the same way that we don’t grant rights to our enemies, nor do we ask for rights from our enemies. This is obviously a complicated issue because, in practice, it’s often difficult to distinguish demanding something and demanding a right to it. I won’t try to deal with every aspect of this question. I’ll just look at the Right to Strike as an example. In general, as I think Hegel said, “for every Right there is a Duty”. So, for example, you have the Right to travel on public transport and a Duty to pay your fare. The right to strike implies that workers are allowed to peacefully withdraw their labour in return for respecting public order and generally not doing anything to make the strike effective. What else can it mean? After all, a right is something granted *by law* – you can hardly approach a cop and ask him to protect you while you burn scab lorries.

I think that, in general, demands for rights are an expression of the weakness of our class. Instead of saying to our enemies “if you lay a finger on us you’ll get your fucking head kicked in”, or even just kicking their heads in anyway, we tend to say “please respect our rights, we don’t really mean you any harm”. Of course, our class *is* in a weak position, and there’s no magic answer to this. But I think one step we can take is to recognise that middle-class do-gooders who campaign for rights *are not on our side* – even if some of them are nice lefty lawyers who sometimes get us out of a lot of trouble.

What I’ve said so far probably isn’t *that* controversial. What I have said so far concerns excluding certain categories of people. Wanting to exclude people from democracy is perfectly compatible with being a democrat – it’s amazing how many liberals will say that they unconditionally support freedom of speech and then suddenly change their minds when if someone says “well, what about fascists then?”

More controversially, I now want to talk about democracy “within in our own ranks” – that is, amongst proletarians in struggle. The usual “workers democracy” argument, for example, will say “OK, we don’t have democratic relations with the bourgeoisie but amongst ourselves there should be the most perfect equality and respect for rights.” This is usually seen as a way of avoiding bureaucratisation and domination by small cliques and ensuring that as many people as possible are involved in a particular struggle. The idea is that if people are allowed the right to speak, the right to vote etc., then you can just go along to a meeting and immediately be part of this democratic collectivity and so immediately be involved.

What does democratising a struggle mean in practice? It means things like:

- 1) **Majoritarianism** – Nothing can be done unless a majority agree to it.
- 2) **Separation between decision making and action** – Nothing can be done until everybody has had a chance to discuss it. This can be seen as analogous to the separation between the legislative and executive arms of a democratic state. It’s no coincidence that discussions within democratic organisations often resemble parliamentary debate!
- 3) **Embodiment of the view that no one can be trusted** – Democratic structures take the “war of all against all” for granted, and institutionalise it. Delegates always have to be revocable so they won’t pursue their own hidden agenda which, of course, everyone has.

Thus the ruling party switched from the party of corruption – the Republicans under Bush, to the party of participation – the Democrats under Clinton. But naturally democracy implies many more switches after this.

## Historical Democracy

As capitalism has developed, democracy was held back by local authoritarians and by the capitalist’s fear that the idea of democracy would make people ungovernable.

Now that capital has perfected democratic participation, all previous forms of capitalism can be seen as instances of democracy. It is thus not surprising that democratic think tanks are able to give good advice to dictatorships like Pinochet’s Chile. It is not surprising that Hitler came to power through the democratic operations of the Weimar republic. (There was some cheating but we already know cheating is part of any game.)

Democracy is now the ideal dialogue of capital. Participation in this process is speaking the language of the market whether it is participatory, authoritarian or technical. The methods of military “psy-war” propaganda are the methods of the modern democratic political campaign are the methods of modern government are the methods of leftists discussing ways to improve the system. The enemy is isolated, personalized and attacked using claims that are most likely to get automatic reactions from the isolated spectator.

Every apparent rebellion that failed, every useless exercise of freedom, reappears in the accounting of capital. The system of the Soviet Union was identical to the system of wartime production in our “free-market” system. Thus the final end of the Soviet Union has given the extended insurance system a quantitative measure of state-capitalism versus private enterprise.

The more people relate on the level of “pure democracy,” the more they relate on the level of abstract, formal equality. And the more they have an incentive to solve the system’s problems. Everyone becomes a bureaucrat versus everyone else. Everyone is equal as long as they each play the same role. We are all equal as consumers, voters, TV watchers, or citizens. That is, we can all be exchanged in our functions.

To write a letter to a congressman is to enter into a huge system of data-creation that ultimately makes people less powerful. The ultimate passivity of a permitted, experimentally controlled role makes it predictable.

The stock market, the media consultants, the political think tanks, the pollsters, the market researchers, and the big charities constitute an immense electronic memory bank and simulation of all the permitted choices that “consumers,” “the public,” the spectators, the passive make. The election industry speculates about each way that each given choice is framed and then creates strategies for extracting maximum profits from each citizen’s choice.

With this automation of control, democratic regimes are now the most cost effective. This is part of today’s intensification of democracy. Once ideology sees formal democracy in all acts of government, cost accounting demands that redundant local tyrants be removed. Even in backward areas like Haiti or Somalia, capital moves to replace local butchery with the “accidental” mass murders of democracy.

## Decisions?

Revisionaries oppose every version of democratic ideology. On one hand, after a revolution there won’t be a need to fixate on the process of reaching each decision. For example, one person could decide a day’s delivery schedule in a communal warehouse without oppressing the other workers. Other workers might prefer to spend their time walking on the beach than double checking each decision. The dispatcher would have no coercive power over the other participants in the warehouse. Deciding the schedule would not give her entrenched privilege that she could accumulate and exchange for other things. For their own enjoyment, the workers might want to collectively decide the menu of a communal kitchen even it was a less efficient use of time.

they agree with. This is logical. Why should they care? Everyone knows that things will remain about the same no matter what they do. So why not support a winner instead of a loser? No one cares that politicians lie. They care if the politician gets caught lying. This proves the politician is weak and so a loser.

If you make a choice passively, someone could just as well act on your choice without you having to do anything. Of course presidential elections are only held every four years but if Clinton responds to each month's polls, the government truly hears the passive "voice of the people."

"Would you like me to shoot you now or wait till I get home?" Elmer Fudd to Daffy Duck. "Should the federal government cut services or raise taxes?" Bill Clinton to the working class.

Of course all the choices the media serves up to us have hidden clauses that change their apparent meaning. The federal government reduces its entire budget. Then the local puppets frame the choice of cuts for local voters. These voters then get to support one austerity measure or another.

But this is because the marketplace of ideas works against us. But is this because this market is unfair? No! Even a fair marketplace of ideas simply decides the best direction for capital. Our disadvantage in talk-show dialogues is the same as our disadvantage compared to employers or banks.

### Why Democracy Now?

*"We must learn to make the process of governing as entertaining as we have learned to make [electoral] politics entertaining."*

Max Frankel, editor of *The New York Times*

The game of letting the ruled participate in their own exploitation is not new. The present subtle switch from George Bush's upper-class style to Bill Clinton's democratic style is a counter-part to the rise of the mega-capitalists. The eighties ended with stock market crashes that heralded the end of junk bonds as a strategy for total capital to expand. The economy could no longer be artificially expanded by the easy-money financial manipulations of Michael Miliken, George Bush, Paul Volker and Company.

Instead of artificially expanding, it is now sucking all resources into its empty center. The faction of capitalists at the very top are the billionaires, financiers like Adnan Kashoggi, entrepreneurs like Bill Gates and a host of invisible characters. This small group had their wealth and power tremendously increased by the expansion of financial manipulations and electronic world markets. Currency and "derivative" speculation has expanded until today they involve trillions of dollars changing hands on a weekly basis. This game uses and expands the power of this ultra-rich class.

As today's crisis system moves to marshal every possible force in its defense it uses our choices about how best to be exploited against us. This system is the dictatorship of the commodity, the world market and of the billionaires. But simultaneously it is the rule of democracy. Once all action and every person can be translated into empty choices, those choices can be exchanged with each other like dollars or spectacular images.

If people are given a free choice about how to sell themselves to the world market, then the system in total will run much more smoothly. When commentators say, "let the public decide the best health plan" they mean let people find a plan that gives the insurance companies the highest premiums that workers can pay and still survive on. Managers will give people free-reign to decide which way to sell themselves to the market.

Democracy became the dominant ideology right after "tight-money"/slow growth became the main economic policy. Tight money reigned in financial speculation and began the present system of reorganization-terror. It goaded lower-level capitalists to produce more without spending more. This caused corporations to attack both workers and the previously ignored level of middle management.

The financial capitalists' power depends on the expansion of an abstract chunk of money. So democracy is an ideal strategy. The financial capitalist don't care whether they invest in defense contracting, prisons, computers to track drug-offenders, or for-profit hospitals.

All of these principles embody social atomisation. Majoritarianism because everyone is equal and usually has one vote. The separation between decision making and action because it's only fair that you should consult everyone before acting – if you don't you are violating their rights. A particularly obnoxious example of the third thing – embodying the view that no one can be trusted – is the demand for "Faction Rights" put forward by Trots. Usually they call for this when some organisation is trying to throw them out. What this right amounts to is the freedom to plot and conspire against other members of what is supposedly a working class organisation. Obviously, no genuine communist organisation could *ever* entertain *any* idea of faction Rights.

It is probably the second of these principles which is the most important and which needs to be stressed here.

These democratic principles can only stand in complete opposition to the class struggle since, by definition, the class struggle implies a break with social atomisation and the formation of some kind of community – however narrow, transient or vague this may be.

Major events in the class struggle almost never begin with a vote or with everybody being consulted. They almost always begin with action by a determined minority who break from the passivity and isolation of the majority of proletarians around them. They then try to spread this action through example rather than through reasoned argument. In other words, the division between decision making and action is always being breached in practice. Right-wing populists (and a few anarchists) complain that trouble-making activities are organised by self-appointed cliques of activists who represent no one but themselves...and, of course, they're right!

The miners' strike in the UK in 1984-5 provided many inspiring examples of how the class struggle is anti-democratic in practice. The strike itself did not start democratically – there was no ballot, no series of mass meetings. It began with walk-outs at a few pits threatened with closure, and was then spread by flying pickets. Throughout the strike there was an unholy alliance of the right-wing of the Labour Party and the RCP (Revolutionary Communist Party) saying that the miners should hold a national ballot. The most militant miners consistently rejected this, saying things like: "scabs don't have the right to vote away another man's job" – which is a democratic form of words but I think you will agree that the attitude behind it certainly isn't. On occasions, members of the RCP were quite rightly beaten up and called "Tories" because of their support for a ballot.

There were also numerous examples of sabotage and destruction of Coal Board property, often organised by semi-clandestine, so-called "hit squads". Obviously, such activities, by their very nature, cannot be organised democratically – whether or not they are approved of by a majority of the strikers.

### Community of Struggle

A concept which I've already used here, and which I'm quite attached to, is "community of struggle". Obviously, a question which will be asked is: "If a community of struggle doesn't act democratically, then how *does* it act?". There is no simple answer to this, except to say that the basis of action will be the trust and solidarity between the people involved and not their supposed equality or rights. For example, if we want to send someone as an emissary (well, I don't like the word "delegate") to spread the struggle we wouldn't insist on them being voted for by at least 51% of the meeting or on them carrying a mobile phone so we can recall them at a moment's notice and replace them with someone else. *We would* insist on them being trustworthy and reliable – one trusted comrade is worth a thousand revocable delegates! Of course, there would be a large political component to this trust – we wouldn't send a member of the Labour Party because their political views would automatically lead them to act against the interests of the working class.

## Communist Society

Finally, I want to say a few words about the implication of all this for the nature of communist society.

The idea of communist revolution as a vast democratic reorganisation of society is a very strong one, even within political tendencies which we think might have something going for them. The council communists (such as Pannekoek) literally saw the workers' councils as parliaments of the working class. Even the Situationists had serious hang-ups about democracy – talking about “direct democracy” and so on. If you read “Enragés and Situationists in the movement of the occupations” you'll find them making various claims about how their actions expressed the democratic will of the Sorbonne Assembly while it's obvious that they were continually breaking with the decisions of the assembly or just asking it to rubber-stamp the things that they'd done.

In general, it's no coincidence that people who advocate democracy also tend to advocate self-management – that is, taking over chunks of this society and running them ourselves. The connection is a simple one – communism is about transforming social relations, not just about changing the political regime, which is what the democrats want to do.

In the case of the council communists, self-management was pretty obviously what they were about. With the Situs it was more a case of them not making a real break from their self-managementist origins.

Another example of this kind of problem might be the concept of “planning”, which I know a lot of people are quite attached to. To me, “planning” implies that we all get together and decide what we are going to be doing for the next 5 years and *then* we go away and do it. This sounds like another example of fetishising the moment of decision-making. So, as communists, that is to say: enemies of democracy, I think we should be very suspicious of the concept of planning. As opponents of social-democracy we need to reject *democracy* every bit as vigorously as we reject *socialism*.

## ...AND DEMOCRACY CONTINUES ITS MARCH

*Fetters and headsmen were the coarse instruments which tyranny formerly employed; but the civilization of our age has perfected despotism itself, though it seemed to have nothing to learn.*

Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy In America*.

America really is entering a period of greater democracy. Bill Clinton's election campaign has never stopped. Polls are still being taken about his latest struggles. From the New Hampshire primary to the health care reform campaign, TV has tried to draw us into his endless fights with other mighty bureaucrats – from George Bush to Robert Dole to Saddam Hussein. Even more, we are expected to cheer Clinton in fights against us. “How well do you think that Clinton succeeded in communicating the need for sacrifice to the American people?”

The 1992 elections had the biggest turnout of a presidential election in twenty years. From elections to polls to talk-radio to the internet, never has the average citizen had so many chances for a voice in their government. But this hasn't helped the hapless citizen. The average, passive voter is probably poorer and has less control over his or her life than ever before.

To understand how people lose this game, we have to look at how the game is really played.

In pro basketball, fouling is part of the game. Some teams play with a little more finesse, other use a little more brute strength. The honest fan doesn't look down on the player who fouls, only the player who gets caught. So the player is allowed to do anything – except to question the real rules of the game. If Kurt Rambus (a physical player from a few years back) said at a press conference “Yes, I intend to foul people, that's my job,” he could be expelled from the league.

American Democracy works the same way. If we play the game, we can question everything except the real rules of the game. But here the game is something that dominates our lives.

The game today is exchange. It dominates our daily lives when we must exchange our time at work for our survival. It dominates the world system when the electronic world market allocates all resources by exchange.

Poll takers constantly ask about OJ Simpson's murder trial, the best way to make America more productive or how to keep children off drugs. But answering these sorts of questions only makes people think more in terms of life continuing exactly as it is now. The pollsters' slave questions talk only about how this society should best be run. They assume that everyone will live in a nuclear family, go to work, work really hard for low pay, come home and look at a TV star on the moving screen.

### The Illusion

We attack democracy as such, we don't want “real democracy” instead of “fake democracy.” Today's system of vacuum-packed choices is the flip-side of the market perfecting itself. The progress of exchange, of capital, is also the creation of capital's own model of thinking.

All forms of democratic ideology appeal to a model of human behavior that implies each person is wholly separate social agent who only affects others in fixed, definable ways. Perfect democracy – constant polling, an almost permanent election campaign – merely weighs each impulse in the market place of ideas.

Democracy is the language of “common sense” in a world where capitalism controls people's senses. It defends the right, for example, for a man to shout cat-calls at a woman because that man's actions are simply “free speech” not connected to any social action.

Today's democracy never has to attack its true enemies but only phantasms within itself. It is only the exchange of one sort of rhetoric for another. So all rhetoric of this sort is empty because is only used to shout at another. Most voters vote for the candidate they think will win instead of the candidate